



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/063,317	04/10/2002	Allen Hundhausen	56578-308395	6883
35657 7590 01/12/2007 FAEGRE & BENSON LLP PATENT DOCKETING 2200 WELLS FARGO CENTER 90 SOUTH SEVENTH STREET MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3901			EXAMINER RIES, LAURIE ANNE	
			ART UNIT 2176	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS			01/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/063,317		HUNDHAUSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Laurie Ries		2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 April 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 December 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Original Application, filed 10 April 2002.
2. Claims 1-17 are pending. Claims 1, 8, and 11 are independent claims.

Claim Objections

3. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Misnumbered claim 1.2 been renumbered 2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 3-7, and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Roses (U.S. Publication 2003/0055871 A1).

As per independent claim 1, Roses discloses a method for dynamically constructing a document on a client/server system having pre-defined templates including providing content to the pre-defined templates through a client interface to construct a document (See Roses, Page 3, paragraph 0035).

Roses also discloses transmitting an image of the constructed document to the client interface for viewing in a preview mode (See Roses, Page 3, paragraph 0041).

Roses also discloses merging the templates and the content into a desired format as provided by the selected template (See Roses, Page 2, paragraph 0032-0033).

As per dependent claim 3, Roses discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Roses also discloses transmitting a low resolution image to the client interface (See Roses, Page 4, paragraph 0049).

As per dependent claim 4, Roses discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Roses also discloses maintaining a high resolution representation of the template and the content at the server (See Roses, Page 5, paragraph 0055).

As per dependent claim 5, Roses discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Roses also discloses maintaining a high resolution representation of the template and the content at the server (See Roses Page 5, paragraph 0055) and transmitting a low resolution image of the representation to the client interface (See Roses, Page 4, paragraph 0049).

As per dependent claim 6, Roses discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Roses also discloses saving the constructed document in a variety of formats, as provided by the plurality of templates providing a number of document formats (See Roses, Page 3, paragraph 0040, and Page 7, claim 9).

As per dependent claim 7, Roses discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Roses also discloses publishing the constructed document from the server, such as on the Internet (See Roses, Abstract, lines 6-8).

As per dependent claim 9, Roses discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Roses also discloses saving the constructed document in a variety of formats, as provided by the plurality of templates providing a number of document formats (See Roses, Page 3, paragraph 0040, and Page 7, claim 9).

As per dependent claim 10, Roses discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Roses also discloses publishing the constructed document from the server, such as on the Internet (See Roses, Abstract, lines 6-8).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2, 8, and 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roses (U.S. Publication 2003/0055871 A1) in view of Wang (U.S. Patent 5,333,312).

As per dependent claim 2, Roses teaches the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Roses also teaches creating pre-defined templates by created a document (See Roses, Page 3, paragraphs 0037-0040).

Roses also teaches providing content entry fields in the created document (See Roses, Figure 7 and Page 4, paragraph 0044).

Roses does not teach expressly checking the created document into the system server. Wang teaches checking documents into a server (See Wang, Column 7, lines 45-49).

Roses and Wang are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of creating electronic documents.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the documents of Roses in the document check-in system of Wang.

The motivation for doing so would have been to maintain various versions of a document in order to compare the versions so that the user may determine which version best suits his or her needs.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wang with Roses for the benefit of maintaining various versions of a document in order to compare the versions so that the user may determine which version best suits his or her needs to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

As per independent claim 8, Roses teaches a method for dynamically constructing a document on a client/server system including creating a document (See Roses, Page 3, paragraph 0033).

Roses also teaches providing content entry fields in the template (See Roses Figure 7, and Page 4, paragraph 0044).

Roses also teaches providing a client interface to add content to the content entry fields (See Roses, Figure 7).

Roses also teaches maintaining a high resolution representation of the template and the content at the server (See Roses Page 5, paragraph 0055).

Roses also teaches transmitting a low resolution image of the representation to the client interface (See Roses, Page 4, paragraph 0049).

Roses also teaches merging the templates and the content into a desired format as provided by the selected template (See Roses, Page 2, paragraph 0032-0033).

Roses does not teach expressly checking the document created as a template into the system server as a template. Wang teaches checking documents into a server (See Wang, Column 7, lines 45-49).

Roses and Wang are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of creating electronic documents.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the document templates of Roses in the document check-in system of Wang. The motivation for doing so would have been to maintain various versions of a document template in order to compare the versions so that the user may determine which version best suits his or her needs.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wang with Roses for the benefit of maintaining various versions of a document template in order to compare the versions so that the user may determine which version best suits his or her needs to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

As per independent claim 11, Roses teaches a system for constructing a document through a client/server network including a document management application residing on the server (See Roses, Figure 1, element 110, and Page 2, paragraph 0025).

Roses also teaches a client interface to allow users to add content to the document templates (See Roses, Page 4, paragraph 0044).

Roses also teaches a rendering engine that renders images of the content added to the document template in a representation of the constructed document for viewing on the client interface (See Roses, Page 3, paragraph 0041).

Roses also teaches system for merging the content and the document template into a selected format as provided by the selected template (See Roses, Page 2, paragraph 0032-0033).

Roses also teaches including a document creation program for allowing a selected user to create a document having content entry fields (See Roses, Page 3, paragraph 0035, Figure 7, and Page 4, paragraph 0044).

Roses does not teach expressly checking the created document into the system server as a template. Wang teaches checking documents into a server (See Wang, Column 7, lines 45-49).

Roses and Wang are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of creating electronic documents.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the documents of Roses in the document check-in system of Wang. The motivation for doing so would have been to maintain various versions of a document in order to compare the versions so that the user may determine which version best suits his or her needs.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wang with Roses for the benefit of maintaining various versions of a document in order to compare the versions

so that the user may determine which version best suits his or her needs to obtain the invention as specified in claim 11.

As per dependent claim 12, Roses and Wang teach the limitations of claim 11 as described above. Roses also teaches maintaining a high resolution representation of the content and the document template at the server (See Roses, Page 5, paragraph 0055).

As per dependent claim 13, Roses and Wang teach the limitations of claim 11 as described above. Roses also teaches transmitting a low resolution representation of the content and the document template to the client interface (See Roses Page 4, paragraph 0049).

As per dependent claim 14, Roses and Wang teach the limitations of claim 11 as described above. Roses also teaches maintaining a high resolution representation of the template and the content at the server (See Roses Page 5, paragraph 0055) and transmitting a low resolution image of the representation to the client interface (See Roses, Page 4, paragraph 0049).

As per dependent claim 15, Roses and Wang teach the limitations of claim 11 as described above. Roses also teaches publishing the constructed document from the server, such as on the Internet (See Roses, Abstract, lines 6-8).

As per dependent claim 16, Roses and Wang teach the limitations of claim 11 as described above. Roses also teaches publishing the constructed document from the server, such as over the Internet (See Roses, Abstract, lines 6-8) in a variety of formats,

as provided by the plurality of templates providing a number of document formats (See Roses, Page 3, paragraph 0040, and Page 7, claim 9).

As per dependent claim 17, Roses and Wang teach the limitations of claim 11 as described above. Roses also teaches merging the document template and the content in a variety of formats, as provided by the plurality of templates providing a number of document formats (See Roses, Page 2, paragraph 0032, and Page 7, claim 9).

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Judd (U.S. Publication 2006/0200761 A1) discloses a content management and transformation system for digital content.
- McCurdy (U.S. Publication 2002/0035697 A1) discloses systems and methods for distributing and viewing electronic documents.
- LaMarca (U.S. Patent 6,266,682 B1) discloses tagging related files in a document management system.
- Branting discloses an issue-oriented approach to judicial document assembly.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER